arXiv:1401.2279v1 [math.AP] 10 Jan 2014

SUB-GAUSSIAN HEAT KERNEL ESTIMATES AND QUASI RIESZ TRANSFORMS FOR $1 \leq p \leq 2$

LI CHEN

Abstract. On a complete non-compact Riemannian manifold M, we prove that a so-called quasi Riesz transform is always L^p bounded for $1 < p \leq 2$. If M satisfies the doubling volume property and the sub-Gaussian heat kernel estimate, we prove that the quasi Riesz transform is also of weak type $(1, 1)$.
Mathematics Subject Classification 2010: 58J35 (primary); 42B20 (secondary).
Keywords: Riemannian manifold, heat semigroup, Riesz transform, sub-Gaussian heat kernel estimates.

1. Introduction

Let M be a complete non-compact Riemannian manifold. Let d be the geodesic distance and μ be the Riemannian measure. Denote by $B(x, r)$ the ball of center x and of geodesic radius r. We write $V(x, r) = \mu(B(x, r))$. One says that M satisfies the doubling volume property if, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for any $x \in M$ and $r > 0$,

$$V(x, 2r) \leq CV(x, r). \tag{D}$$

A simple consequence of (D) is that there exist $\nu > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that

$$\frac{V(x, r)}{V(x, s)} \leq C \left(\frac{r}{s}\right)^{\nu}, \ \forall x \in M, \ r \geq s > 0. \tag{1.1}$$

Let ∇ be the Riemannian gradient and Δ be the non-negative Laplace-Beltrami operator on M. By definition and by spectral theory, we have

$$\int_M |\nabla f|^2 d\mu = \int_M (\Delta f) f d\mu. = \int_M \left(\Delta^{1/2} f\right)^2 d\mu, \ \forall f \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(M).$$

It was asked by Strichartz [34] in 1983 on which non-compact Riemannian manifold M, and for which p, $1 < p < +\infty$, the two semi-norms $\||\nabla f|\|_p$ and $\|\Delta^{1/2} f\|_p$ were equivalent on $\mathcal{C}_0^\infty(M)$. That is, when do there exist two constants c_p, C_p such that

$$c_p \|\Delta^{1/2} f\|_p \leq \||\nabla f|\|_p \leq C_p \|\Delta^{1/2} f\|_p, \ \forall f \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(M)? \tag{E_p}$$

One says that the Riesz transform $\nabla \Delta^{-1/2}$ is L^p bounded on M if

$$\||\nabla f|\|_p \leq C \|\Delta^{1/2} f\|_p, \ \forall f \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(M). \tag{R_p}$$

Ever since, a lot of work has been dedicated to address the problem, see for example, [5, 16, 17, 3, 2, 13, 12, 20, 23] and the references therein.

Date: January 13, 2014.

Denote by $e^{-t\Delta}$ the heat semigroup associated with Δ and $p_t(x,y)$ the heat kernel, that is

$$e^{-t\Delta}f(x) = \int_M p_t(x,y)f(y)d\mu(y),\ f \in L^2(M,\mu), \mu\text{-a.e. } x \in M.$$

Estimates of the heat kernel and its derivatives happen to be a key ingredient for the boundedness of the Riesz transform.

Let us first recall a result of Coulhon and Duong in [16].

Theorem 1.1. *Let M be a complete non-compact manifold satisfying (D). Assume that*

$$(DUE) \qquad p_t(x,x) \leq \frac{C}{V(x,\sqrt{t})},$$

for all $x \in M$, $t > 0$ and some $C > 0$. Then the Riesz transform $\nabla\Delta^{-1/2}$ is of weak type $(1,1)$ and (R_p) holds for $1 < p \leq 2$.

Under the doubling volume property, (DUE) self-improves into the Gaussian heat kernel estimate (see for example [19], [28]):

$$(UE) \qquad p_t(x,y) \leq \frac{C}{V(x,\sqrt{t})}\exp\left(-c\frac{d^2(x,y)}{t}\right),\ \forall x,y \in M, t > 0.$$

Note that (R_p) may be false under (D) and (DUE) for $p > 2$. For example, the connected sum of two copies of $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 2$, does satisfy (D) and (DUE), but the Riesz transform is not L^p bounded for $p > n$. We refer to [16, 13, 12] for more details. However, it is not known whether (DUE) is necessary for the L^p boundedness of the Riesz transform for $1 < p < 2$.

We are going to see that one can still obtain a weaker version of (R_p) for $1 < p \leq 2$ without assuming any heat kernel estimates.

To this end, we first localise the Riesz transform at infinity. Then one can consider some weaker variants of this localisation. In fact, we are going to prove that on every complete manifold the Riesz transform is almost bounded in the following sense:

Theorem 1.2. *Let M be a complete manifold. Then, for any $\alpha \in (0,1/2)$, the operator $\nabla e^{-\Delta}\Delta^{-\alpha}$ is bounded on L^p for all $1 < p \leq 2$.*

Together with known local results, this yields:

Proposition 1.3. *Let M be a complete Riemannian manifold satisfying (D_{loc}) and (DUE_{loc}), then the quasi Riesz transform $\nabla(I+\Delta)^{-1/2}+\nabla e^{-\Delta}\Delta^{-\alpha}$ with $\alpha \in (0,1/2)$ is L^p bounded for $1 < p \leq 2$. Here (D_{loc}) and (DUE_{loc}) are local versions of (D) and (DUE) to be explained below.*

Remark 1.4. It is also equivalent to say that the operator $\nabla(\Delta^\alpha + \Delta^{1/2})^{-1}$ is L^p bounded.

A natural question would be to ask whether (R_p) holds if we replace (DUE) with some other kind of heat kernel estimates, for instance, the sub-Gaussian heat kernel upper bound introduced in [31, 29] as follows:

Definition 1.5. We say that the heat kernel on M satisfies the sub-Gaussian upper bound with $m > 2$ if for any $x, y \in M$,

$$p_t(x,y) \le \frac{C}{V\left(x, \rho^{-1}(t)\right)} \exp\left(-cG(d(x,y),t)\right), \tag{UE_m}$$

where

$$\rho(t) = \begin{cases} t^2, & 0 < t < 1, \\ t^m, & t \ge 1; \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

and

$$G(r,t) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{r^2}{t}, & t \le r, \\ \left(\dfrac{r^m}{t}\right)^{1/(m-1)}, & t \ge r. \end{cases} \tag{1.3}$$

Note that $(UE_2) = (UE)$. For $m > 2$, (UE_m) is neither stronger nor weaker than (UE), see Section 3.1 below. See also Section 3.1 for examples that satisfy (UE_m).

Under (D) and (UE_m), we are not able to show that the Riesz transform is L^p bounded for $1 < p < 2$. But we are able to treat the endpoint case $p = 1$ of Proposition 1.3. Indeed, we have

Theorem 1.6. *Let M be a complete Riemannian manifold satisfying (D) and (UE_m). Then for any $0 < \alpha < 1/2$, the quasi Riesz transform $\nabla(I+\Delta)^{-1/2} + \nabla e^{-\Delta}\Delta^{-\alpha}$ is of weak type $(1,1)$.*

Note that one can define Hardy spaces associated with the Laplacian via square functions, which are adapted to the heat kernel estimates, and show that $\nabla e^{-\Delta}\Delta^{-\alpha}$ is $H^1 - L^1$ bounded, see [14].

The plan of this paper is as follows:

In Section 2, we describe the relations between Riesz transform, local Riesz transform, Riesz transform at infinity and quasi Riesz transform, and we prove Theorem 1.2.

In Section 3, we consider Riemannian manifolds satisfying (D) and (UE_m). We show Theorem 1.6.

Throughout this paper, we often write B for the ball $B(x_B, r_B)$. For any given $\lambda > 0$, we will write λB for the λ dilated ball, which is the ball with the same center as B and with radius $r_{\lambda B} = \lambda r_B$. We denote $C_1(B) = 4B$, and $C_j(B) = 2^{j+1}B \backslash 2^j B$ for $j = 2, 3, \cdots$.

The letters c, C denote positive constants, which can change in different circumstances. We say that $A \lesssim B$ if there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $A \le CB$. And $A \simeq B$ if there exist two positive constants c, C with $c \le C$ such that $cA \le B \le CA$.

2. L^p boundedness of quasi Riesz transforms

In this section, unless otherwise stated, we always consider an arbitrary complete Riemannian manifold M without any other assumptions.

We could as well consider a metric measure space setting associated with a regular and strongly local Dirichlet form, which admits a "carré du champ" (see [6, 30]).

2.1. **Localisation of Riesz transforms.**

Write the Riesz transform

$$\nabla\Delta^{-1/2} = \int_0^\infty \nabla e^{-t\Delta}\frac{dt}{t^{1/2}}.$$

Alexopoulos [1] separated the integral into local and global parts as $\int_0^1 + \int_1^\infty$ and considered them respectively to show the L^p boundedness of the Riesz transform.

An alternative and equivalent method given in [25] is to consider the following local Riesz transform and Riesz transform at infinity:

For $1 < p < \infty$, we say that the local Riesz transform is L^p bounded if

$$(R_p^{loc}) \qquad \||\nabla f|\|_p \leq C\left\|(I+\Delta)^{1/2} f\right\|_p,\ \forall f \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(M).$$

and the Riesz transform at infinity is L^p bounded if

$$(R_p^{\infty}) \qquad \left\|\left|\nabla e^{-\Delta} f\right|\right\|_p \leq C\left\|\Delta^{1/2} f\right\|_p,\ \forall f \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(M).$$

Remark 2.1. Note that at high frequencies, $(I+\Delta)^{-1/2} \simeq \Delta^{-1/2}$. Thus locally $\nabla(I+\Delta)^{-1/2}$ is the Riesz transform. Similarly, since $e^{-\Delta}\Delta^{-\alpha} \simeq \Delta^{-1/2}$ when $\Delta \ll \epsilon$ (i.e. at low frequencies), we can regard the operator $\nabla e^{-\Delta}\Delta^{-1/2}$ as the localisation of Riesz transform at infinity.

A local version of Theorem 1.1 says

Theorem 2.2 ([16])**.** *Let M be a complete Riemannian manifold satisfying the local doubling volume property (D_{loc})*

$$(D_{loc}) \qquad \forall r_0 > 0, \exists C_{r_0} \text{ such that } V(x,2r) \leq C_{r_0} V(x,r),\ \forall x \in M, r \in (0, r_0),$$

and whose volume growth at infinity is at most exponential in the sense that

$$V(x,\lambda r) \leq Ce^{c\lambda} V(x,r),\ \forall x \in M, \lambda > 1, r \leq 1.$$

Suppose

$$(DUE_{loc}) \qquad p_t(x,x) \leq \frac{C}{V(x,\sqrt{t})},\ \forall x \in M, t \in (0,1].$$

Then (R_p^{loc}) holds for $1 < p \leq 2$.

Examples that satisfy the above assumptions include Riemannian manifolds with Ricci curvature bounded from below.

We can characterise the L^p boundedness of Riesz transform by the combination of (R_p^{loc}) and (R_p^{∞}). That is,

Theorem 2.3. *Let M be a complete Riemannian manifold. Then, for $1 < p < \infty$, the Riesz transform $\nabla\Delta^{-1/2}$ is L^p bounded on M if and only if (R_p^{loc}) and (R_p^{∞}) hold.*

The proof relies on the following multiplier theorem due to Cowling:

Theorem 2.4 ([21]). *Let M be a measure space. Let L be the generator of a bounded analytic semigroup on $L^p(M)$ for $1 < p < \infty$ such that e^{-tL} is positive and contractive for $t > 0$. Suppose that F is a holomorphic function in the sectorial $\Sigma_\sigma = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |\arg(z)| < \sigma\}$, where $\pi/2 < \sigma \leq \pi$. Then*

$$\|F(L)f\|_p \leq C\|f\|_p, \ \forall f \in L^p(M),$$

where C depends on p, σ and F.

Proof of Theorem 2.3: First assume (R_p). For any $f \in C_0^\infty(M)$, on the one hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \big\||\nabla(I+\Delta)^{-1/2}f|\big\|_p &= \big\||\nabla\Delta^{-1/2}\Delta^{1/2}(I+\Delta)^{-1/2}f|\big\|_p \\ &\leq C\big\|\Delta^{1/2}(I+\Delta)^{-1/2}f\big\|_p \leq C\|f\|_p. \end{aligned}$$

Here the last inequality follows from Theorem 2.4.

On the other hand, (R_p^∞) holds obviously due to the L^p boundedness of the heat semigroup. In fact,

$$\big\||\nabla e^{-\Delta}\Delta^{-1/2}f|\big\|_p \leq C\big\|e^{-\Delta}f\big\|_p \leq C\|f\|_p.$$

Conversely, assume (R_p^{loc}) and (R_p^∞), then

$$\begin{aligned} \||\nabla f|\|_p &\leq \big\||\nabla e^{-\Delta}f|\big\|_p + \big\||\nabla(I-e^{-\Delta})f|\big\|_p \\ &\lesssim \big\|\Delta^{1/2}f\big\|_p + \big\||\nabla(I+\Delta)^{-1/2}(I+\Delta)^{1/2}(I-e^{-\Delta})\Delta^{-1/2}\Delta^{1/2}f|\big\|_p \\ &\lesssim \big\|\Delta^{1/2}f\big\|_p + \big\|(I+\Delta)^{1/2}(I-e^{-\Delta})\Delta^{-1/2}\Delta^{1/2}f\big\|_p \\ &\lesssim \big\|\Delta^{1/2}f\big\|_p. \end{aligned}$$

Here the last inequality is due to Theorem 2.4. □

We shall now introduce a variation of the Riesz transform at infinity. Let $0 < \alpha < 1/2$. We say that M satisfies $(R_p^{\infty,\alpha})$ if

$$(R_p^{\infty,\alpha}) \qquad \big\||\nabla e^{-\Delta}f|\big\|_p \leq C\|\Delta^\alpha f\|_p, \ \forall f \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(M).$$

Together with the local Riesz transform, it will give us a notion of Quasi Riesz transform.

Note that (R_p^∞) implies $(R_p^{\infty,\alpha})$. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \big\||\nabla e^{-\Delta}\Delta^{-\alpha}f|\big\|_p &\leq \big\||\nabla e^{-\Delta/2}\Delta^{-1/2}e^{-\Delta/2}\Delta^{1/2-\alpha}f|\big\|_p \\ &\leq C\big\|e^{-\Delta/2}\Delta^{1/2-\alpha}f\big\|_p \\ &\leq C\|f\|_p. \end{aligned}$$

2.2. **Equivalence of (G_p) and (MI_p).** For any $1 \le p \le \infty$, let us considering the following L^p interpolation or multiplicative inequality:

$$(MI_p) \qquad \||\nabla f|\|_p^2 \le C\|\Delta f\|_p\|f\|_p,\ \forall f \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(M),$$

as well as the following L^p estimate for the gradient of the heat semigroup:

$$(G_p) \qquad \left\|\left|\nabla e^{-t\Delta}\right|\right\|_{p\to p} \le \frac{C_p}{\sqrt{t}},\ \forall t > 0.$$

Recall that (R_p) implies (G_p) and (MI_p). In fact, (G_p) and (MI_p) are equivalent for any $1 \le p \le \infty$.

Proposition 2.5 ([20, 24])**.** *Let M be a complete Riemannian manifold. Then, for any $1 \le p \le \infty$, (G_p) is equivalent to (MI_p).*

See [20] for more information about the relations between (MI_p), the Riesz transforms, and estimates of the derivative of the heat kernel. For the sake of completeness, we give a proof here.

Proof. First assume (MI_p). Substituting f by $e^{-t\Delta}f$ in (MI_p) yields

$$\left\|\left|\nabla e^{-t\Delta}f\right|\right\|_p^2 \le C\left\|\Delta e^{-t\Delta}f\right\|_p\left\|e^{-t\Delta}f\right\|_p.$$

Since the heat semigroup is analytic on $L^p(M)$, we obtain

$$\left\|\left|\nabla e^{-t\Delta}f\right|\right\|_p \le Ct^{-1/2}\|f\|_p.$$

Conversely assume (G_p). For any $f \in C_0^\infty(M)$, write the identity

$$f = e^{-t\Delta}f + \int_0^t \Delta e^{-s\Delta}f ds,\ \forall t > 0.$$

Then (G_p) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\||\nabla f|\|_p &\le C\left\|\left|\nabla e^{-t\Delta}f\right|\right\|_p + \left\|\int_0^t |\nabla\Delta e^{-s\Delta}f|ds\right\|_p \\
&\le Ct^{-1/2}\|f\|_p + \int_0^t \left\|\left|\nabla e^{-s\Delta}\Delta f\right|\right\|_p ds \\
&\le Ct^{-1/2}\|f\|_p + Ct^{1/2}\|\Delta f\|_p.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking $t = \|f\|_p\|\Delta f\|_p^{-1}$, we get (MI_p). □

As an application of Proposition 2.5, we get

Proposition 2.6. *Let M be a complete Riemannian manifold satisfying (G_p) for some $p \in (1,\infty)$. Then for any $\alpha \in (0,1/2)$, $(R_p^{\infty,\alpha})$ holds.*

Proof. For any $f \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(M)$, write

$$\nabla e^{-\Delta}\Delta^{-\alpha}f = \int_0^\infty \nabla e^{-(1+t)\Delta}f\frac{dt}{t^{1-\alpha}}.$$

From Proposition 2.5, we have (G_p) for any $p \in (1,2]$. Thus

$$\left\|\left|\nabla e^{-\Delta}\Delta^{-\alpha}f\right|\right\|_p \le \int_0^\infty \left\|\left|\nabla e^{-(1+t)\Delta}f\right|\right\|_p\frac{dt}{t^{1-\alpha}} \le C_p\|f\|_p\int_0^\infty \frac{dt}{(t+1)^{1/2}t^{1-\alpha}},$$

which obviously converges for $\alpha \in (0,1/2)$. □

2.3. L^p **boundedness of quasi Riesz transform for** $1 < p \leq 2$**.** This part is inspired by [17] and [24], where (MI_p) and (G_p) for $1 < p \leq 2$ were shown on manifolds and graphs respectively.

In the following, we will show (MI_p) and (G_p) directly by the method which is used in [33] to prove the L^p boundedness of the Littlewood-Paley-Stein function (see also [18, Theorem 1.2]). In [24, Theorem 1.3], an analogue proof was given in the discrete case.

Proposition 2.7. *Let M be a complete Riemannian manifold. Then (MI_p) and (G_p) hold for $1 < p \leq 2$.*

Proof. Assume that $f \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(M)$ is non-negative and not identically zero. Set $u(x,t) = e^{-t\Delta} f(x)$. Then u is smooth and positive everywhere. For any $1 < p \leq 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} J(x,t) &:= \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \Delta\right) u^p(x,t) \\ &= p u^{p-1}(x,t) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \Delta\right) u(x,t) - p(p-1) u^{p-2}(x,t) |\nabla u(x,t)|^2 \\ &= -p(p-1) u^{p-2}(x,t) |\nabla u(x,t)|^2, \end{aligned}$$

which yields

$$|\nabla u(x,t)|^2 = -\frac{1}{p(p-1)} u^{2-p}(x,t) J(x,t).$$

Also note that $J(x,t)$ is non-positive and $\int_M \Delta u^p(x,t) d\mu(x) = 0$.

With these preparations, we get by Hölder inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla u(\cdot,t)\|_p^p &\leq C \int_M u^{p(2-p)/2} (-J(x,t))^{p/2} d\mu(x) \\ &\leq C \left(\int_M u^p d\mu(x)\right)^{(2-p)/2} \left(-\int_M J(x,t) d\mu(x)\right)^{p/2}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

Note that (2.4) uses the fact that $1 < p \leq 2$.

Next, since $\int_M \Delta u^p(x,t) d\mu(x) = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} -\int_M J(x,t) d\mu(x) &= -\int_M \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u^p(x,t) d\mu(x) = \int_M p u^{p-1}(x,t) \Delta u(x,t) d\mu(x) \\ &\leq C \left(\int_M u^p(x,t) d\mu(x)\right)^{1/p'} \left(\int_M (\Delta u(x,t))^p d\mu(x)\right)^{1/p}, \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality is again due to Hölder inequality and p' is the conjugate of p.

Combining the above two estimates, then

$$\||\nabla u(\cdot,t)|\|_p^p \leq C \|u(\cdot,t)\|_p^{p/2} \|\Delta u(\cdot,t)\|_p^{p/2}. \tag{2.5}$$

On the one hand, since $u(\cdot,t) \to f$ as t goes to zero, we get the multiplicative inequality from (2.5)

$$\||\nabla f|\|_p^p \leq C \|f\|_p^{p/2} \|\Delta f\|_p^{p/2}.$$

On the other hand, by the analyticity of the heat semigroup, (2.5) yields

$$\||\nabla u(\cdot,t)|\|_p^p \leq C t^{-p/2} \|f\|_p^p,$$

which is exactly (G_p). □

Remark 2.8. Note that Proposition 2.7 can not be extended to the case $p > 2$ without additional assumptions. Indeed (G_p) for $p > 2$ has consequences that are not always true, see [3].

Combining Proposition 2.6 and Proposition 2.7, we get

Corollary 2.9. *Let M be a complete Riemannian manifold. Then for any fixed $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$, the operator $\nabla e^{-\Delta}\Delta^{-\alpha}$ is L^p bounded for $1 < p \leq 2$.*

3. Sub-Gaussian heat kernel estimates and quasi Riesz transforms

Remember that with local assumptions on the manifold, we get the L^p $(1 < p \leq 2)$ boundedness of quasi Riesz transforms $\nabla(I + \Delta)^{-1/2} + \nabla e^{-\Delta}\Delta^{-\alpha}$, where $0 < \alpha < 1/2$. If we assume in addition a global Gaussian heat kernel upper bound, the Riesz transform itself is L^p bounded for $1 < p \leq 2$ and weak $(1, 1)$ bounded. What happens if we suppose globally another heat kernel upper bound, the so-called sub-Gaussian upper bound (UE_m)?

In the case of Riemannian manifolds satisfying (D) and (UE_m), Proposition 1.3 tells us that the quasi Riesz transform is L^p bounded for $1 < p \leq 2$. Yet we don't know whether the Riesz transform, which corresponds to $\alpha = 1/2$, is L^p bounded or not for $1 < p \leq 2$. Instead, we will study the endpoint case for the quasi Riesz transform, that is, what happens for $p = 1$? In the following, we will prove the weak $(1, 1)$ boundedness of the quasi Riesz transform.

3.1. **More about sub-Gaussian heat kernel estimate.** One can rewrite (UE_m) as follows:

$$p_t(x,y) \leq \begin{cases} \dfrac{C}{V(x,t^{1/2})} \exp\left(-c\dfrac{d^2(x,y)}{t}\right), & t < \min\{1, d(x,y)\}, \\ \dfrac{C}{V(x,t^{1/2})} \exp\left(-c\left(\dfrac{d^m(x,y)}{t}\right)^{1/(m-1)}\right), & d(x,y) \leq t < 1, \\ \dfrac{C}{V(x,t^{1/m})} \exp\left(-c\dfrac{d^2(x,y)}{t}\right), & 1 \leq t < d(x,y), \\ \dfrac{C}{V(x,t^{1/m})} \exp\left(-c\left(\dfrac{d^m(x,y)}{t}\right)^{1/(m-1)}\right), & t \geq \max\{1, d(x,y)\}. \end{cases}$$

Note that for $d(x,y) \leq t$, one has $\frac{d^2(x,y)}{t} \leq \left(\frac{d^m(x,y)}{t}\right)^{1/(m-1)}$. And for $t \leq d(x,y)$, one has $\frac{d^2(x,y)}{t} \geq \left(\frac{d^m(x,y)}{t}\right)^{1/(m-1)}$. Thus we have the following estimate:

$$p_t(x,y) \leq \begin{cases} \dfrac{C}{V(x,t^{1/2})} \exp\left(-c\dfrac{d^2(x,y)}{t}\right), & 0 < t < 1, \\ \dfrac{C}{V(x,t^{1/m})} \exp\left(-c\left(\dfrac{d^m(x,y)}{t}\right)^{1/(m-1)}\right), & t \geq 1. \end{cases} \tag{3.6}$$

That is, the small time behaviour of the heat kernel is Gaussian as in Euclidean spaces while the heat kernel has a sub-Gaussian decay for large time.

There exist such manifolds for all $m \geq 2$. One can choose any $D \geq 1$ and any $2 \leq m \leq D+1$ such that $V(x,r) \simeq r^D$ for $r \geq 1$ and (UE_m) holds. Indeed, fractal manifolds, which are built from graphs with a fractal structure at infinity, provide examples satisfying (UE_m) with some $m > 2$ (in fact, two-sided sub-Gaussian heat kernel estimates). We refer to [7] for the construction of suitable graphs. For a concrete example, Barlow, Coulhon and Grigor'yan in [11] constructed such a manifold whose discretisation is the Vicsek graph. For more examples, see the work of Barlow and Bass [8], [9], [10]. We also refer to [29, 31] for more general non-classical heat kernel estimates on metric measure spaces.

Comparison with the Gaussian heat kernel estimate (UE):

$$p_t(x,y) \leq \frac{C}{V(x,\sqrt{t})} \exp\left(-c\frac{d^2(x,y)}{t}\right), \ \forall x,y \in M, t > 0.$$

Since $m > 2$, $p_t(x,x)$ decays with t more slowly in the sub-Gaussian case than in the Gaussian case. Also for $t \geq \max\{1, d(x,y)\}$, $p_t(x,y)$ decays with $d(x,y)$ faster in the sub-Gaussian case than in the Gaussian case. Therefore the two kinds of pointwise estimates are not comparable.

3.2. **Weighted estimates of the heat kernel.** Let (M,d,μ) be a non-compact complete manifold satisfying the doubling volume property (D) and the sub-Gaussian estimate (UE_m). In the following, we aim to get the integral estimates for the heat kernel and its time and space derivatives, which furthermore imply the $L^1 - L^2$ off-diagonal estimates. The method we use here is similar as in [16, Section 2.3].

First, we have the pointwise estimate of the time derivative of heat kernel:

Lemma 3.1. *Let M be as above, then we have*

$$\left|\frac{\partial}{\partial t}p_t(x,y)\right| \leq \begin{cases} \dfrac{C}{tV\left(y,t^{1/2}\right)} \exp\left(-c\dfrac{d^2(x,y)}{t}\right), & t < 1, \\ \dfrac{C}{tV\left(y,t^{1/m}\right)} \exp\left(-c\left(\dfrac{d^m(x,y)}{t}\right)^{1/(m-1)}\right), & t \geq 1. \end{cases} \tag{3.7}$$

Proof. We see from [22] (Thm. 4 and Cor. 5) that there exist an $a \in (0,1)$ such that for $0 < t < a$

$$\left|\frac{\partial}{\partial t}p_t(x,y)\right| \leq \frac{C}{tV\left(y,t^{1/2}\right)} \exp\left(-c\frac{d^2(x,y)}{t}\right);$$

and for $t > a^{-1}$,

$$\left|\frac{\partial}{\partial t}p_t(x,y)\right| \leq \frac{C}{tV\left(y,t^{1/m}\right)} \exp\left(-c\left(\frac{d^m(x,y)}{t}\right)^{1/(m-1)}\right).$$

For $t \in (a,1)$, according to [22], Cor.5, it suffices to show that there exists a constant $\delta \in (0,1)$ such that for all $s \in [(1-\delta)t, (1+\delta)t]$

$$p_s(x,y) \leq \frac{C}{V\left(y,s^{1/2}\right)} \exp\left(-c\frac{d^2(x,y)}{s}\right).$$

This is obvious since $V(x,s^{1/2}) \simeq V(x,s^{1/m})$ and $\frac{d^2(x,y)}{t} \leq \left(\frac{d(x,y)}{t}\right)^{m/(m-1)}$ for $t \geq d(x,y)$.

The case for $t \in [1, a^{-1})$ is similar. Due to the facts $V(x,s^{1/2}) \simeq V(x,s^{1/m})$ and $\frac{d^2(x,y)}{t} \geq \left(\frac{d(x,y)}{t}\right)^{m/(m-1)}$ for $t \leq d(x,y)$, there exists a constant $\delta \in (0,1)$ such that for all $s \in [(1-\delta)t, (1+\delta)t]$,

$$p_s(x,y) \leq \frac{C}{V\left(y, s^{1/m}\right)} \exp\left(-c\left(\frac{d^m(x,y)}{s}\right)^{1/(m-1)}\right).$$

Therefore, we obtain (3.7). □

Now we intend to estimate $\int_{B(x,r)^c} |\nabla p_t(x,y)| d\mu(x)$ for any $t > 0$ and $r \geq 0$.

Lemma 3.2. *For any $\alpha \in (1/m, 1/2)$, we have for any $y \in M$ and $r \geq 0$,*

$$\int_{M\setminus B(y,r)} |\nabla p_t(x,y)| d\mu(x) \leq \begin{cases} Ct^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-c\frac{r^2}{t}}, & 0 < t < 1, \\ Ct^{-\alpha} e^{-c\left(\frac{r^m}{t}\right)^{\frac{1}{m-1}}}, & t \geq 1. \end{cases} \tag{3.8}$$

Remark 3.3. Note that the estimate (3.8) holds for any $0 < \alpha < 1/2$. But in the proof below, α can not achieve $1/2$ unless $m = 2$. This allows us to obtain the weak $(1,1)$ boundedness of $\nabla e^{-\Delta}\Delta^{-\alpha}$, not the Riesz transform. If one could get (3.8) with $\alpha = 1/2$, the proof in Section 4 below would yield the boundedness of the Riesz transform.

Proof. For $0 < t < 1$, the above estimate is proved in [16].

Now for $t \geq 1$. Comparing with the proof of the Gaussian case in [16], we need to replace the weight $\exp\left(-c\frac{d^2(x,y)}{t}\right)$ by $\exp\left(-c\left(\frac{d^m(x,y)}{t}\right)^{1/(m-1)}\right)$ (c is chosen appropriately).

Step 1: For any $c > 0$,

$$\int_{M\setminus B(y,r)} \exp\left(-c\left(\frac{d^m(x,y)}{t}\right)^{1/(m-1)}\right) d\mu(x) \lesssim e^{-\frac{c}{2}\left(\frac{r^m}{t}\right)^{1/(m-1)}} V\left(y, t^{1/m}\right). \tag{3.9}$$

Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{M\setminus B(y,r)} \exp\left(-c\left(\frac{d^m(x,y)}{t}\right)^{1/(m-1)}\right) d\mu(x)\\
\leq\ & e^{-\frac{c}{2}\left(\frac{r^m}{t}\right)^{1/(m-1)}} \int_M \exp\left(-\frac{c}{2}\left(\frac{d^m(x,y)}{t}\right)^{1/(m-1)}\right) d\mu(x)\\
\leq\ & e^{-\frac{c}{2}\left(\frac{r^m}{t}\right)^{1/(m-1)}} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \int_{B(y,(i+1)t^{1/m})/B(y,it^{1/m})} \exp\left(-\frac{c}{2}\left(\frac{d^m(x,y)}{t}\right)^{1/(m-1)}\right) d\mu(x)\\
\leq\ & e^{-\frac{c}{2}\left(\frac{r^m}{t}\right)^{1/(m-1)}} V\left(y,t^{1/m}\right) \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (i+1)^{\nu} e^{-\frac{c}{2}i^{1/(m-1)}}\\
\leq\ & Ce^{-\frac{c}{2}\left(\frac{r^m}{t}\right)^{1/(m-1)}} V\left(y,t^{1/m}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Step 2: For $0<\gamma<2c$ (c is the constant in (UE_m)), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_M p_t(x,y)^2 \exp\left(\gamma\left(\frac{d^m(x,y)}{t}\right)^{1/(m-1)}\right) d\mu(x)\\
\leq\ & \frac{C}{V^2\left(y,t^{1/m}\right)} \int_M \exp\left((\gamma-2c)\left(\frac{d^m(x,y)}{t}\right)^{1/(m-1)}\right) d\mu(x) \leq \frac{C_\gamma}{V\left(y,t^{1/m}\right)}.
\end{aligned}$$

This is a consequence of (UE_m) and Step 1 with $r=0$.

Step 3: Denote

$$I(t,y)=\int_M |\nabla_x p_t(x,y)|^2 \exp\left(\gamma\left(\frac{d^m(x,y)}{t}\right)^{1/(m-1)}\right) d\mu(x),$$

with γ small enough. Using integration by parts,

$$\begin{aligned}
I(t,y) =\ & \int_M p_t(x,y)\Delta p_t(x,y) \exp\left(\gamma\left(\frac{d^m(x,y)}{t}\right)^{1/(m-1)}\right) d\mu(x)\\
& -\int_M p_t(x,y)\nabla_x p_t(x,y)\cdot\nabla_x \exp\left(\gamma\left(\frac{d^m(x,y)}{t}\right)^{1/(m-1)}\right) d\mu(x)\\
=\ & -\int_M p_t(x,y)\frac{\partial}{\partial t}p_t(x,y) \exp\left(\gamma\left(\frac{d^m(x,y)}{t}\right)^{1/(m-1)}\right) d\mu(x)\\
& -\frac{\gamma m}{m-1}\int_M p_t(x,y)\nabla_x p_t(x,y)\left(\frac{d(x,y)}{t}\right)^{1/(m-1)}\\
& \cdot\nabla_x d(x,y) \exp\left(\gamma\left(\frac{d^m(x,y)}{t}\right)^{1/(m-1)}\right) d\mu(x)\\
=\ & I_1(t,y)+I_2(t,y).
\end{aligned}$$

According to Lemma 3.1 and Step 1,

$$|I_1(t,y)| \le \frac{C'_\gamma}{tV\left(y,t^{1/m}\right)}.$$

For I_2, since $|\nabla_x d(x,y)| \le 1$ and $\left(\frac{d(x,y)}{t}\right)^{1/(m-1)} = \left(\frac{d^m(x,y)}{t}\right)^{1/m(m-1)} t^{-1/m}$, then from Step 2 and Cauchy-Schwartz inequality,

$$|I_2(t,y)| \le C''_\gamma t^{-1/m} (I(t,y))^{1/2} \left(\frac{C_\gamma}{V\left(y,t^{1/m}\right)}\right)^{1/2}.$$

We get

$$\begin{aligned} I(t,y) &\le \frac{C'_\gamma}{tV\left(y,t^{1/m}\right)} + t^{-1/m}(I(t,y))^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{C''_\gamma}{V\left(y,t^{1/m}\right)}\right)^{1/2} \\ &\le \frac{C'_\gamma}{t^{2/m}V\left(y,t^{1/m}\right)} + (I(t,y))^{1/2} \left(\frac{C''_\gamma}{t^{2/m}V\left(y,t^{1/m}\right)}\right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$I(t,y) \le \frac{C}{t^{2/m}V\left(y,t^{1/m}\right)}. \tag{3.10}$$

Step 4: We divide the integral $\int_{M\setminus B(y,r)} |\nabla p_t(x,y)| d\mu(x)$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{M\setminus B(y,r)} |\nabla p_t(x,y)| d\mu(x) &= \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \int_{2^i r < d(x,y) \le 2^{i+1} r} |\nabla p_t(x,y)| d\mu(x) \\ &\le \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} V^{1/2}\left(y, 2^{i+1}r\right) \left(\int_{2^i r < d(x,y) \le 2^{i+1} r} |\nabla p_t(x,y)|^2 d\mu(x)\right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

For each $i \ge 0$, it follows from (3.15) that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\int_{2^i r < d(x,y) \le 2^{i+1} r} |\nabla p_t(x,y)|^2 d\mu(x)\right)^{1/2} \\ \le &\left(\int_{2^i r < d(x,y) \le 2^{i+1} r} |\nabla p_t(x,y)|^2 \exp\left(c\left(\frac{d^m(x,y)}{t}\right)^{1/(m-1)}\right) d\mu(x)\right)^{1/2} \cdot e^{-c\left(\frac{2^{im} r^m}{t}\right)^{1/(m-1)}} \\ \le &\frac{C}{t^{1/m} V^{1/2}(y,t^{1/m})} e^{-c\left(\frac{2^{im} r^m}{t}\right)^{1/(m-1)}}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

On the other hand, applying (3.9) with $r = 0$ (as well as the corresponding estimate for $t/2 < 1$),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\int_{2^i r<d(x,y)\le 2^{i+1}r} |\nabla p_t(x,y)|^2 d\mu(x)\right)^{1/2}\\
\le&\left\|\left|\nabla e^{-\frac{t}{2}\Delta}\right|\right\|_{2\to 2}\left\|p_{\frac{t}{2}}(\cdot,y)\right\|_2\\
\le&\frac{C}{t^{1/2}V(y,\rho^{-1}(t/2))}\left(\int_M \exp\left(-cG(t/2,d(y,z))\right)d\mu(z)\right)^{1/2}\\
\le&\frac{C}{t^{1/2}V^{1/2}(y,t^{1/m})}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

Thus taking $\theta = \frac{\frac{1}{2}-\alpha}{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{m}}$, we get from (3.11) and (3.12) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\int_{2^i r<d(x,y)\le 2^{i+1}r} |\nabla p_t(x,y)|^2 d\mu(x)\right)^{1/2}\\
\le&\left(\frac{C}{t^{1/m}V^{1/2}(y,t^{1/m})}e^{-c\left(\frac{2^{im}r^m}{t}\right)^{1/(m-1)}}\right)^{\theta}\left(\frac{C}{t^{1/2}V^{1/2}(y,t^{1/m})}\right)^{1-\theta}\\
\le&\frac{C}{t^{\alpha}V^{1/2}(y,t^{1/m})}e^{-c\left(\frac{2^{im}r^m}{t}\right)^{1/(m-1)}},
\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

where c depends on α.

Finally (1.1) and (3.13) yield

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{M\setminus B(y,r)} |\nabla p_t(x,y)|d\mu(x) &\le \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} V^{1/2}\left(y,2^{i+1}r\right)\frac{C}{t^{\alpha}V^{1/2}(y,t^{1/m})}e^{-c\left(\frac{2^{im}r^m}{t}\right)^{1/(m-1)}}\\
&\le Ct^{-\alpha}e^{-c\left(\frac{r^m}{t}\right)^{1/(m-1)}}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

As consequences of the former Lemma, we have the following Davies-Gaffney estimates for heat kernel and its gradient. In fact, we adopt a similar proof as in [4].

Corollary 3.4. *For any ball B with radius r and $j \ge 2$ and any function $f \in \mathcal{C}_0^{\infty}(B)$, we have*

$$\frac{1}{\mu^{1/2}(2^jB)}\|e^{-t\Delta}f\|_{L^2(C_j(B))} \le \begin{cases} \dfrac{Ce^{-c\frac{4^j r^2}{t}}}{\mu(B)}\|f\|_{L^1(B)}, & 0<t<1,\\ \dfrac{Ce^{-c\left(\frac{2^{jm}r^m}{t}\right)^{1/(m-1)}}}{\mu(B)}\|f\|_{L^1(B)}, & t\ge 1. \end{cases} \tag{3.14}$$

Proof. We focus on the case $t \ge 1$. It has been shown in Step 3 of Lemma 3.2 that for $t \ge 1$,

$$\left(\int_M |p_t(x,y)|^2 \exp\left(c\left(\frac{d^m(x,y)}{t}\right)^{1/(m-1)}\right)d\mu(x)\right)^{1/2} \le \frac{C}{V^{1/2}\left(y,t^{1/m}\right)}. \tag{3.15}$$

Thus for all $y \in B$ and $t \geq 1$, we get from (3.15) as well as (D) that, for $j \geq 2$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left(\frac{1}{\mu(2^{j+1}B)}\int_{C_j(B)}|p_t(x,y)|^2 d\mu(x)\right)^{1/2}\\
\leq&\left(\frac{1}{\mu(2^{j+1}B)}\int_M |p_t(x,y)|^2 \exp\left(c\left(\frac{d^m(x,y)}{t}\right)^{1/(m-1)}\right)d\mu(x)\right)^{1/2}\\
&\times\exp\left(-c\left(\frac{2^{jm}r^m}{t}\right)^{1/(m-1)}\right)\\
\leq&\frac{C}{\mu^{1/2}(2^{j+1}B)V^{1/2}(y,t^{1/m})}\cdot e^{-c\left(\frac{2^{jm}r^m}{t}\right)^{1/(m-1)}}\\
\leq&\frac{C}{\mu(B)}\cdot e^{-c\left(\frac{2^{jm}r^m}{t}\right)^{1/(m-1)}}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.16}
$$

Now for $p \in [1,2]$ and $f \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(B)$, by using Minkowski inequality, Jensen inequality and (3.16), we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{\mu^{1/2}(2^{j+1}B)}\|e^{-t\Delta}f\|_{L^2(C_j(B))}\\
\leq&\int_B |f(y)|\left(\frac{1}{\mu(2^{j+1}B)}\int_{C_j(B)}|p_t(x,y)|^2 d\mu(x)\right)^{1/2} d\mu(y)\\
\leq&\ Ce^{-c\left(\frac{2^{jm}r^m}{t}\right)^{1/(m-1)}}\frac{1}{\mu(B)}\int_B |f(y)|d\mu(y).
\end{aligned}
$$

For $0 < t < 1$, the proof is alike and thus (3.14) holds. □

3.3. **Weak** $(1,1)$ **boundedness of quasi Riesz transforms.** In order to show the weak $(1,1)$ boundedness of quasi Riesz transform, we will use the Calderón-Zygmund decomposition. Let us recall the result:

Theorem 3.5. *Let (M,d,μ) be a metric measured space satisfying the doubling volume property. Then for any given function $f \in L^1(M)\cap L^2(M)$ and $\lambda > 0$, there exists a decomposition of f, $f = g + b = g + \sum_i b_i$ so that*

1. *$|g(x)| \leq C\lambda$ for almost all $x \in M$;*
2. *There exists a sequence of balls $B_i = B(x_i, r_i)$ so that each b_i is supported in B_i,*
$$\int |b_i(x)|d\mu(x) \leq C\lambda\mu(B_i) \text{ and } \int b_i(x)d\mu(x) = 0;$$
3. *$\sum_i \mu(B_i) \leq \frac{C}{\lambda}\int |f(x)|d\mu(x)$;*
4. *$\|b\|_1 \leq C\|f\|_1$ and $\|g\|_1 \leq (1+C)\|f\|_1$;*
5. *There exists $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$ such that each $x \in M$ is contained in at most k balls B_i.*

We refer to [15] and [32] for the proof.

Our result is

Theorem 3.6. *Let M be a complete Riemannian manifold satisfying (D) and (UE_m). Then for any $0 < \alpha < 1/2$, the quasi Riesz transform $\nabla(I+\Delta)^{-1/2} + \nabla e^{-\Delta}\Delta^{-\alpha}$ is of weak type $(1,1)$.*

Remark 3.7. By Marcinkiewicz interpolation theorem, this gives back Theorem 1.2, but under much stronger assumptions.

Proof. Note that the local Riesz transform $\nabla(I+\Delta)^{-1/2}$ is of weak type $(1,1)$ (see Theorem 2.2). Denote $T = \nabla e^{-\Delta}\Delta^{-\alpha}$, it remains to show that

$$\mu(\{x : |Tf(x)| > \lambda\}) \leq C\lambda^{-1}\|f\|_1.$$

We will adopt the singular integral technique used by Coulhon and Duong in [16], which was first developed by Duong and McIntosh in [26].

Fix $f \in L^1(M) \cap L^2(M)$, we take the Calderón-Zygmund decomposition of f at the level of λ, i. e., $f = g + b = g + \sum_i b_i$, then

$$\mu(\{x : |Tf(x)| > \lambda\}) \leq \mu(\{x : |Tg(x)| > \lambda/2\}) + \mu(\{x : |Tb(x)| > \lambda/2\}).$$

Since T is L^2 bounded, by using Theorem 3.5 we get

$$\mu(\{x : |Tg(x)| > \lambda/2\}) \leq C\lambda^{-2}\|g\|_2^2 \leq C\lambda^{-1}\|g\|_1 \leq C\lambda^{-1}\|f\|_1.$$

As for the second term, we divide $\{B_i\}$ into two classes: the one in which the balls have radius no less than 1 and the one in which the balls have radius smaller than 1. Denote by

$$\mathcal{C}_1 = \{i : B_i = B(x_i, r_i) \text{ with } r_i \geq 1\};$$
$$\mathcal{C}_2 = \{i : B_i = B(x_i, r_i) \text{ with } r_i < 1\}.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(\{x : |T\sum_i b_i(x)| > \lambda/2\}) \;\leq\; & \mu(\{x : |T\sum_{i\in\mathcal{C}_1} b_i(x)| > \lambda/4\}) \\ & + \mu(\{x : |T\sum_{i\in\mathcal{C}_2} b_i(x)| > \lambda/4\}).\end{aligned}$$

Write

$$Tb_i = Te^{-t_i\Delta}b_i + T\left(I - e^{-t_i\Delta}\right)b_i, \tag{3.17}$$

where $t_i = \rho(r_i)$ with ρ defined in (1.2). In the following, we will consider the two cases of balls separately.

Case 1: For balls with radius no less than 1, our aim here is to prove

$$\mu(\{x : |T\sum_{i\in\mathcal{C}_1} b_i(x)| > \lambda/4\}) \leq C\lambda^{-1}\|f\|_1.$$

Using (3.17), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(\{x : |T\sum_{i\in\mathcal{C}_1} b_i(x)| > \lambda/4\}) \;\leq\; & \mu(\{x : |T\sum_{i\in\mathcal{C}_1} e^{-t_i\Delta}b_i(x)| > \lambda/8\}) \\ & + \mu(\{x : |T\sum_{i\in\mathcal{C}_1}(I - e^{-t_i\Delta})b_i(x)| > \lambda/8\}).\end{aligned}$$

We begin to estimate the first term. Since T is L^2 bounded, then

$$\mu(\{x : |T\sum_{i\in\mathcal{C}_1} e^{-t_i\Delta}b_i(x)| > \lambda/8\}) \le \frac{C}{\lambda^2}\left\|\sum_{i\in\mathcal{C}_1} e^{-t_i\Delta}b_i\right\|_2^2.$$

Note that for any $j \ge 1$, it holds

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|e^{-t_i\Delta}b_i\right\|_{L^2(C_j(B_i))} &\le C\frac{\mu^{1/2}(2^{j+1}B_i)}{\mu(B_i)}e^{-c2^{jm/(m-1)}}\|b_i\|_1 \\ &\le C\lambda\mu^{1/2}(2^{j+1}B_i)e^{-c2^{jm/(m-1)}}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

Indeed, for $j \ge 2$, the first inequality follows from Corollary 3.4. For $j = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|e^{-t_i\Delta}b_i\right\|^2_{L^2(4B_i)} &= \int_{4B_i}|p_{t_i}(x,y)b_i(y)|^2d\mu(x) \le C\|b_i\|_1^2\int_{4B_i}V^{-2}(x,r_i)d\mu(x) \\ &\le C\frac{\mu(4B_i)}{\mu^2(B_i)}\|b_i\|_1^2 \le C\lambda^2\mu(4B_i).\end{aligned}$$

By a duality argument,

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\sum_{i\in\mathcal{C}_1} e^{-t_i\Delta}b_i\right\|_2 &= \sup_{\|\phi\|_2=1}\int_M\left|\sum_{i\in\mathcal{C}_1}e^{-t_i\Delta}b_i\right||\phi|d\mu \le \sup_{\|\phi\|_2=1}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{C}_1}\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\int_{C_j(B_i)}\left|e^{-t_i\Delta}b_i\right||\phi|d\mu \\ &:= \sup_{\|\phi\|_2=1}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{C}_1}\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}A_{ij}.\end{aligned}$$

Applying Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and (3.18), we get

$$\begin{aligned}A_{ij} &\le \left\|e^{-t_i\Delta}b_i\right\|_{L^2(C_j(B_i))}\|\phi\|_{L^2(C_j(B_i))} \\ &\le C\lambda\mu(2^{j+1}B_i)e^{-c2^{jm/(m-1)}}\operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{y\in B_i}\left(M\big(|\phi|^2\big)(y)\right)^{1/2} \\ &\le C\lambda 2^{jD}e^{-c2^{jm/(m-1)}}\mu(B_i)\operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{y\in B_i}\left(M\big(|\phi|^2\big)(y)\right)^{1/2}.\end{aligned}$$

Here M denotes the Littlewood-Paley maximal operator:

$$Mf(x) = \sup_{B\ni x}\frac{1}{\mu(B)}\int_B|f(y)|d\mu(y).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\sum_{i\in\mathcal{C}_1} e^{-t_i\Delta}b_i\right\|_2 &\le C\lambda\sup_{\|\phi\|_2=1}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{C}_1}\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}2^{jD}e^{-c2^{jm/(m-1)}}\mu(B_i)\operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{y\in B_i}\left(M\big(|\phi|^2\big)(y)\right)^{1/2} \\ &\le C\lambda\sup_{\|\phi\|_2=1}\int\sum_{i\in\mathcal{C}_1}\chi_{B_i}(y)\left(M\big(|\phi|^2\big)(y)\right)^{1/2}d\mu(y) \\ &\le C\lambda\sup_{\|\phi\|_2=1}\int_{\cup_{i\in\mathcal{C}_1}B_i}\left(M\big(|\phi|^2\big)(y)\right)^{1/2}d\mu(y) \\ &\le C\lambda\mu(\cup_{i\in\mathcal{C}_1}B_i) \le C\|f\|_1.\end{aligned}$$

In the last line, the first inequality is due to the finite overlapping of the Calderón-Zygmund decomposition. In the second inequality, we use Kolmogorov's inequality (see for example [27, page 91]).

Therefore, we obtain

$$\mu(\{x : |T\sum_{i\in\mathcal{C}_1} e^{-t_i\Delta}b_i(x)| > \lambda/8\}) \leq C\lambda^{-1}\|f\|_1.$$

It remains to show $\mu(\{x : |T\sum_{i\in\mathcal{C}_1}(I-e^{-t_i\Delta})b_i(x)| > \lambda/8\}) \leq C\lambda^{-1}\|f\|_1$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mu(\{x : |T\sum_{i\in\mathcal{C}_1}(I-e^{-t_i\Delta})b_i(x)| > \lambda/8\}) \\
\leq\ & \mu(\{x \in \bigcup_{i\in\mathcal{C}_1} 2B_i : |T\sum_{i\in\mathcal{C}_1}(I-e^{-t_i\Delta})b_i(x)| > \lambda/8\}) \\
& +\mu(\{x \in M\setminus \bigcup_{i\in\mathcal{C}_1} 2B_i : |T\sum_{i\in\mathcal{C}_1}(I-e^{-t_i\Delta})b_i(x)| > \lambda/8\}) \\
\leq\ & \sum_{i\in\mathcal{C}_1}\mu(2B_i) + \frac{8}{\lambda}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{C}_1}\int_{M\setminus 2B_i}|T(I-e^{-t_i\Delta})b_i(x)|d\mu(x).
\end{aligned}$$

We claim: $\forall t \geq 1$, $\forall b$ with support in B, then

$$\int_{M\setminus 2B}|T(I-e^{-t\Delta})b(x)|d\mu(x) \leq C\|b\|_1.$$

Therefore, by using Theorem 3.5, we obtain

$$\mu(\{x : |T\sum_{i\in\mathcal{C}_1}(I-e^{-t_i\Delta})b_i(x)| > \lambda/8\}) \leq \sum_{i\in\mathcal{C}_1}\mu(2B_i) + \frac{C}{\lambda}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{C}_1}\|b_i\|_1 \leq C\lambda^{-1}\|f\|_1.$$

Denote by $k_t(x,y)$ the kernel of the operator $T(I-e^{-t_i\Delta})$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{M\setminus 2B}|T(I-e^{-t\Delta})b(x)|d\mu(x) &\leq \int_{M\setminus 2B}\int_B |k_t(x,y)||b(y)|d\mu(y)d\mu(x) \\
&\leq \int_M |b(y)|\int_{d(x,y)\geq t^{1/m}}|k_t(x,y)|d\mu(x)d\mu(y).
\end{aligned}$$

It is enough to show that $\int_{d(x,y)\geq t^{1/2}}|k_t(x,y)|d\mu(x)$ is uniformly bounded for $t \geq 1$.

The identity $\Delta^{-\alpha} = \int_0^\infty e^{-s\Delta}\frac{ds}{s^{1-\alpha}}$ (we ignore the constant here) gives us

$$T(I-e^{-t\Delta}) = \int_0^\infty \nabla e^{-(s+1)\Delta}(I-e^{-t\Delta})\frac{ds}{s^{1-\alpha}},$$

that is,

$$\begin{aligned}
k_t(x,y) &= \int_0^\infty (\nabla p_{s+1}(x,y) - \nabla p_{s+t+1}(x,y))\,\frac{ds}{s^{1-\alpha}} \\
&= \int_0^\infty \left(\frac{1}{s^{1-\alpha}} - \frac{1_{\{s>t\}}}{(s-t)^{1-\alpha}}\right)\nabla p_{s+1}(x,y)ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus by using the estimate (3.8), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{d(x,y)\geq t^{1/m}} |k_t(x,y)|\, d\mu(x)\\
=\ &\int_{d(x,y)\geq t^{1/m}} \left|\int_0^\infty \left(\frac{1}{s^{1-\alpha}} - \frac{1_{\{s>t\}}}{(s-t)^{1-\alpha}}\right) \nabla p_{s+1}(x,y) ds\right| d\mu(x)\\
\leq\ &\int_0^\infty \left|\frac{1}{s^{1-\alpha}} - \frac{1_{\{s>t\}}}{(s-t)^{1-\alpha}}\right| \cdot \int_{d(x,y)\geq t^{1/m}} |\nabla p_{s+1}(x,y)|\, d\mu(x) ds\\
\lesssim\ &\int_0^\infty \left|\frac{1}{s^{1-\alpha}} - \frac{1_{\{s>t\}}}{(s-t)^{1-\alpha}}\right| (s+1)^{-\alpha} e^{-c\left(\frac{t}{s+1}\right)^{1/(m-1)}} ds\\
=\ &\left(\int_0^1 + \int_1^t\right) \frac{1}{s^{1-\alpha}(s+1)^\alpha} e^{-c\left(\frac{t}{s+1}\right)^{1/(m-1)}} ds\\
&+ \int_t^\infty \left|\frac{1}{s^{1-\alpha}} - \frac{1}{(s-t)^{1-\alpha}}\right| (s+1)^{-\alpha} e^{-c\left(\frac{t}{s+1}\right)^{1/(m-1)}} ds\\
=\ &K_1 + K_2 + K_3.
\end{aligned}$$

In fact, K_1, K_2, K_3 are uniformly bounded:

$$K_1 \leq \int_0^1 s^{\alpha-1} ds < \infty;$$

Since $s+1 \simeq s$ for $s > 1$ and we can dominate the e^{-x} by Cx^{-c} for any fixed $c > 0$, we have

$$K_2 \leq \int_1^t e^{-c'\left(\frac{t}{s}\right)^{1/(m-1)}} \frac{ds}{s} \leq C \int_1^t \left(\frac{s}{t}\right)^c \frac{ds}{s} < \infty;$$

For K_3,

$$\begin{aligned}
K_3\ &\leq\ \int_t^\infty \left|\frac{1}{s^{1-\alpha}} - \frac{1}{(s-t)^{1-\alpha}}\right| s^{-\alpha} ds\\
&=\ \int_0^\infty \left|\frac{1}{(u+1)^{1-\alpha}} - \frac{1}{u^{1-\alpha}}\right| (u+1)^{-\alpha} du\\
&\leq\ \int_0^1 \left(\frac{1}{(u+1)} + \frac{1}{u^{1-\alpha}}\right)(u+1)^{-\alpha} du + \int_1^\infty \frac{1}{(u+1)u^{1-\alpha}} du\\
&\leq\ \int_0^1 \frac{2}{u^{1-\alpha}} du + \int_1^\infty \frac{1}{u^{2-\alpha}} du < \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that we get the second line by changing variable with $u = \frac{s}{t} - 1$.

Case 2: It remains to show

$$\mu(\{x : |T \sum_{i\in\mathcal{C}_2} b_i(x)| > \lambda/4\}) \leq C\lambda^{-1}\|f\|_1.$$

We repeat the argument as Case 1. Still from (3.17), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(\{x:|T\sum_{i\in\mathcal{C}_2}b_i(x)|>\lambda/4\}) &\leq \mu(\{x:|T\sum_{i\in\mathcal{C}_2}e^{-t_i\Delta}b_i(x)|>\lambda/8\})\\ &\quad+\mu(\{x:|T\sum_{i\in\mathcal{C}_2}(I-e^{-t_i\Delta})b_i(x)|>\lambda/8\}).\end{aligned}$$

By using the L^2 boundedness of T and Corollary 3.4, the same duality argument in Case 1 yields

$$\mu(\{x:|T\sum_{i\in\mathcal{C}_2}e^{-t_i\Delta}b_i(x)|>\lambda/8\})\leq C\lambda^{-1}\|f\|_1.$$

For the estimate of $\mu(\{x:|T\sum_{i\in\mathcal{C}_2}(I-e^{-t_i\Delta})b_i(x)|>\lambda/8\})$, it suffices to show that $\int_{d(x,y)\geq t^{1/2}}|k_t(x,y)|d\mu(x)$ is finite and does not depend on $t<1$. In fact,

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{d(x,y)\geq t^{1/2}}|k_t(x,y)|\,d\mu(x)\\ \leq\ &\int_0^\infty\left|\frac{1}{s^{1-\alpha}}-\frac{1_{\{s>t\}}}{(s-t)^{1-\alpha}}\right|\cdot\int_{d(x,y)\geq t^{1/2}}|\nabla p_{s+1}(x,y)|d\mu(x)ds\\ \lesssim\ &\int_0^\infty\left|\frac{1}{s^{1-\alpha}}-\frac{1_{\{s>t\}}}{(s-t)^{1-\alpha}}\right|(s+1)^{-\alpha}e^{-c\left(\frac{t^{m/2}}{s+1}\right)^{1/(m-1)}}ds\\ =\ &\int_0^t\frac{1}{s^{1-\alpha}(s+1)^\alpha}e^{-c\left(\frac{t^{m/2}}{s+1}\right)^{1/(m-1)}}ds\\ &+\int_t^\infty\left|\frac{1}{s^{1-\alpha}}-\frac{1}{(s-t)^{1-\alpha}}\right|(s+1)^{-\alpha}e^{-c\left(\frac{t^{m/2}}{s+1}\right)^{1/(m-1)}}ds\\ :=\ &K_1'+K_2'.\end{aligned}$$

Because $t<1$, thus $K_1'<K_1$ converges.

We can estimate K_2' in the same way as for K_3 and get a bound that does not depend on t. □

Acknowledgements: I would like to thank Thierry Coulhon for many helpful discussions and for his constant encouragement. Thanks are also due to Frédéric Bernicot for Remark 1.4. The results in this paper are part of my PhD thesis in preparation in cotutelle between the Laboratoire de Mathématiques, Orsay and the Mathematical Science Institute, Canberra under the supervision of Pascal Auscher and Thierry Coulhon.

References

[1] G. K. Alexopoulos, Sub-Laplacians with drift on Lie groups of polynomial volume growth, *Memoirs of Amer. Math. Soc.* **155(739)** (2002).

[2] P. Auscher and T. Coulhon, Riesz transform on manifolds and Poincaré inequalities, *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5)* **4(3)** (2005), 531–555.

[3] P. Auscher, T. Coulhon, X. T. Duong and S. Hofmann, Riesz transform on manifolds and heat kernel regularity, *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)* **37(6)** (2004), 911–957.

[4] P. Auscher and J.- M. Martell, Weighted norm inequalities, off-diagonal estimates and elliptic operators. IV. Riesz transforms on manifolds and weights, *Math. Z.* **260(3)** (2008), 527–539.
[5] D. Bakry, Etude des transformations de Riesz dans les variétés riemanniennes à courbure de Ricci minorée, Séminaire de probabilités, XXI, *Lecture Notes in Math.* **1247** (1987), 137–172.
[6] D. Bakry and M. Émery, Diffusions hypercontractives, Séminaire de probabilités, XIX, 1983/84, *Lecture Notes in Math.* **1123** (1985), 177–206.
[7] M. Barlow, Which values of the volume growth and escape time exponent are possible for a graph?, *Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana* **20(1)** (2004), 1–31.
[8] M. Barlow and R. Bass Transition densities for Brownian motion on the Sierpiński carpet, *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **91(3-4)** (1992), 307–330.
[9] M. Barlow and R. Bass Brownian motion and harmonic analysis on Sierpinski carpets, *Canad. J. Math.* **51(4)** (1999), 673-744.
[10] M. Barlow and R. Bass Brownian motion and harmonic analysis on Sierpinski carpets, *Random walks and discrete potential theory (Cortona, 1997)* Sympos. Math., XXXIX, 26–55. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1999.
[11] M. Barlow, T. Coulhon and A. Grigor'yan, Brownian motion and harmonic analysis on Sierpinski carpets, *Invent. Math.* **144(3)** (2001), 609–649.
[12] G. Carron, Riesz transforms on connected sums, *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* **57(7)** (2007), 2329–2343.
[13] G. Carron, T. Coulhon and A. Hassell, Riesz transform and L^p-cohomology for manifolds with Euclidean ends, *Duke Math. J.* **133(1)** (2006), 59–93.
[14] L. Chen, Sub-Gaussian heat kernel estimates, Hardy spaces and Riesz transforms, Phd Thesis in preparation.
[15] R. Coifman and G. Weiss, *Analyse harmonique non-commutative sur certains espaces homogènes*, Lecture notes in Math. **242**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1971.
[16] T. Coulhon and X. T. Duong, Riesz transforms for $1 \leq p \leq 2$, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **351(3)** (1999), 1151–1169.
[17] T. Coulhon and X. T. Duong, Riesz transform and related inequalities on noncompact Riemannian manifolds, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **56(12)** (2003), 1728–1751.
[18] T. Coulhon, X. T. Duong and X. D. Li, Littlewood-Paley-Stein functions on complete Riemannian manifolds for $1 \leq p \leq 2$, *Studia Math.* **154(1)** (2003), 37–57.
[19] T. Coulhon and A. Sikora, Gaussian heat kernel bounds via Phragmén-Lindelöf theorem, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* **96(2)** (2008), 507–544.
[20] T. Coulhon and A. Sikora, Riesz meets Sobolev, *Colloq. Math.* **118(2)** (2010), 685–704.
[21] M. Cowling, Harmonic analysis on semigroups, *Ann. of Math. (2)* **117(2)** (1983), 267–283.
[22] E. B. Davies, Non-Gaussian aspects of heat kernel behaviour, *J. London Math. Soc. (2)* **55(1)** (1997), 105–125.
[23] B. Devyver, A perturbation result for the Riesz transform, *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci.* to appear.
[24] N. Dungey, A Littlewood-Paley-Stein estimate on graphs and groups, *Studia Math.* **189(2)** (2008), 113–129.
[25] N. Dungey, A. F. M. ter Elst and D. W. Robinson, *Analysis on Lie groups with polynomial growth*, Progress in Mathematics **214**, Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 1971.
[26] X. T. Duong and A.McIntosh, Singular integral operators with non-smooth kernels on irregular domains, *Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana* **15(2)** (1999), 233–265.
[27] L. Grafakos, *Classical Fourier analysis*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics **249**, Springer, New York, 2008.
[28] A. Grigor'yan, *Heat kernel and analysis on manifolds*, AMS/IP Studies in Advanced Mathematics **47**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2009.
[29] A. Grigor'yan and A. Telcs, Two-sided estimates of heat kernels on metric measure spaces, *Ann. Proba.* **40(3)** (2012), 1212–1284.
[30] P. Gyrya and L. Saloff-Coste, *Neumann and Dirichlet heat kernels in inner uniform domains*, Astérisque 336, Soc. Math. de France, 2011.

[31] W. Hebisch and L. Saloff-Coste, On the relation between elliptic and parabolic Harnack inequalities, *Ann. Inst. Fourier*, **51(5)** (2001), 1437–1481.
[32] E. M. Stein, *Singular integrals and differentiability properties of functions*, Princeton Mathematical Series **30**, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, N. J., 1970.
[33] E. M. Stein, *Topics in harmonic analysis related to the Littlewood-Paley theory*, Annals of Mathematics Studies **63**, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, N. J., 1970.
[34] R. S. Strichartz, Analysis of the Laplacian on the complete Riemannian manifold, *J. Funct. Anal.* **52(1)** (1983), 48–79.

Li CHEN, Mathematical Sciences Institute, The Australian National University, Canberra ACT 0200, Australia
E-mail address: li.chen@anu.edu.au